

REMARKS

The final Office Action dated February 24, 2006 has been reviewed and carefully considered. Claims 1-29 are pending in the application.

On page 3 of the Office Action, claims 1-29 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Brooke et al. in view of XSL Example.

Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections.

The Office Action cites the XML Example as showing the use of XSL stylesheets. The Office Action admits on page 2 that there is no date on this particular webpage, but the use of XML and XSL code has been known since the late 1990s.

However, Applicants traverse the propriety of the citation of the "XML Example" document and asserts that a prima facie case of obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) has not been shown because the use of the "XML Example" as prior art is improper.

According to 37 C.F.R. § 1.104(d)(1) regarding the nature of examination, "[i]f printed publications are cited, the author (if any), title, date, pages or plates, and place of publication, or place where a copy can be found, will be given."

Further, MPEP 707.05(e) states that "[b]ibliographic information provided must be at least enough to identify the publication, author, title and date." More specifically regarding electronic documents, MPEP 707.05(e) IV states "[t]he format for the citation of an electronic document is as similar as possible to the format used for paper documents of the same type, but with the addition of the following information in the locations indicated, where appropriate: . . . (B) the date when the document was retrieved from the electronic media in square brackets following after the date of publication, e.g., [retrieved on March 4, 1998], [retrieved on 1998-03-04]. The four-digit year must always be given."

MPEP 2128 specifically identifies when a disclosures on the Internet may be relied upon as prior art. MPEP 2128 states that "[p]rior art disclosures on the Internet or on an on-line database are considered to be publicly available as of the date the item was publicly posted. If the publication does not include a publication date (or retrieval date), it cannot be relied upon as prior art . . ."

Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of claims 1-29 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) be withdrawn.

Moreover, the "XML Example" fails to overcome the deficiencies of Brooke et al. admitted in the Office Action. The "XML Example" merely explains the use of a XSL stylesheet as described in Applicants background. In order to use the XSL stylesheet in conjunction with another file, i.e., the DTD file, to display information in a browser. The DTD file is a "Document Type Definition" that is used to define content, identify elements allowed in the file, which elements can be contained in other elements, and identifies the number of times specific elements may be contained in other elements. Nevertheless, the cascading stylesheet (CSS) file is what is used to set the style of the elements.

Accordingly, to display the XML data, the CSS (i.e., xmlpartstyle.css) is applied to the XML data and a transformation processor (XSLT). The transformation processor generates formatted objects that are input to a composer that generates the final-form pages for display. The final-form pages may be converted into a page description language.

Thus, the simple use of a CSS does not equate to Applicants' invention as recited in the claims. For example, the "XML Example" does not suggest providing a data map containing XML descriptors defining the formatting for elemental content of the XML file, identifying the XML descriptors by qualified tags and searching a data map to match content associated with a

parsed XML tag with formatting instructions associated with a qualified tag corresponding to the XML tag. By parsing the XML file to identify a tag upon which a qualified tag is generated, the present invention, as recited in the claims, allows a data map to be searched for an XML descriptor with a matching qualified tag, wherein the content of the element is formatted with the XML descriptor having the matching qualified tag. While the present invention imposes some limitations on the XML, e.g. the XML must be text-based and cannot contain external resource references, a more direct and faster method to print XML than using CSS stylesheets as disclosed in the XML Example is provided.


Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that Brooke et al and XML Example, alone or in combination, fail to teach, disclose or suggest the invention as recited in the claims.

On the basis of the above amendments and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that the claims are in immediate condition for allowance. Accordingly, reconsideration of this application and its allowance are requested.

If a telephone conference would be helpful in resolving any issues concerning this communication, please contact Attorney for Applicant, David W. Lynch, at 423-757-0264.

Respectfully submitted,

Chambliss, Bahner and Stophel
1000 Tallan Building
Two Union Square
Chattanooga, TN 37402
423-757-0264

By: 
Name: David W. Lynch
Reg. No.: 36,204